DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 317 SO 021 458

AUTHOR Burn, Barbara B.
TITLE The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans: Projections for the Year 2000. Occasional Papers on International Education Exchange. Forum Series 26.
INSTITUTION Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Foreign Culture; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; International Education; *International Educational Exchange; International Relations; *Student Exchange Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to forecast the scope and profile of educational exchanges between the United States and other countries in the year 2000 as one approach to assessing the contribution of those exchanges to the international education of U.S. citizens. The forecasts are based in part on predictions relating to political stability, economic growth, and likely developments in higher education in major world regions. The first part reviews major world regions including the following highlights: the probable growth in exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; the centrality of solving the debt crisis to the future of Latin America nations and exchanges with those countries; and the likely growth in exchanges involving Asia, propelled by its burgeoning economic situation, especially in Japan. The second part of the paper focuses on the contribution of international educational exchanges to U.S. citizens learning about other countries, culture, and international issues. This is done in terms of foreign students in the United States, U.S. students going abroad, faculty exchanges, and how international learning might be enhanced by each activity. The paper concludes that special efforts are required if international educational exchanges are to make a more significant contribution to U.S. international education; the mere existence of exchange does not assure this contribution. This situation should be more widely understood if such efforts are to receive the support they require. Some specific recommendations propose strategies and programs to strengthen the contribution of exchanges to international learning in the United States. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336317

OCCASIONAL PAPERS 26

The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans: Projections for the Year 2000

Barbara B. Burn

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
PRISCILLA M. TOREY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SO 021 458

Council on International Educational Exchange

The Council on International Educational Exchange is a private, nonprofit, membership organization, incorporated in the United States with international offices, affiliations, and representation. The Council, founded in 1947 by a small group of organizations active in international education and student travel, was established to restore student exchange after World War II. In its early years the Council chartered ocean liners for transatlantic student sailings, arranged group air travel, and organized orientation programs to prepare students and teachers for educational experiences abroad. Over the years the Council's mandate has broadened dramatically and its activities and programs abroad have spread beyond Europe to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Today the Council develops and administers a wide variety of study, work, and travel programs for American and international students at the secondary, undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels.

The Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans:

Projections for the Year 2000

by
Barbara B. Burn

August 1990

Council on International Educational Exchange
205 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017

50

Table of Contents

Foreword v

Executive Summary vii

Introduction 1

Developments Likely to Affect International Exchanges 3
The International Political Scene
The International Educational Scene
The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe
The Middle East and North Africa
Latin America
Africa South of the Sahara
Asia
Western Europe
The United States

Implications of Pertinent Developments Worldwide for Exchanges 23

International Exchanges and International Learning 27
Foreign Students
- Host Family Programs
- Interaction of Foreign and U.S. Students
- International Speakers Bureau
- Community Education Programs
- International Classrooms
- Foreign Student Interaction with Business and Other Groups

Study Abroad by American Students
International Exchanges of Faculty

Conclusion 39

Recommendations 41

Notes 43

Foreword

In early May of 1989, the Liaison Group for International Educational Exchange sponsored a conference entitled Exchange 2000. Forty people representing the members of the Liaison Group (including CIEE), other educational associations, and members of the Washington, D.C., political community met to discuss the role that international educational exchange should play in the future of the United States. Papers were prepared on five different topics—foreign policy, economic and social perspectives, technology, the arts, and education—to provide a basis for the meetings. This paper on education was written by Dr. Barbara Burn of the University of Massachusetts, a former chair of CIEE's board of directors.

The publication of this excellent analysis and forecast of the contribution of international educational exchange to the international education of Americans is to be celebrated. In a field of self-avowed practitioners, too few of us have the time or energy to read and think with such focus and perspective. Barbara has the extraordinary capacity to take facts and figures from familiar sources, add information from related works, and bring them all together into a clear and insightful document. This paper is not only worthy of reading once, it derserves a place among your reference materials. It is a remarkably comprehensive description of the current state of international educational exchange and the challenges which face us. Barbara's refreshing approach to the issues provides us with questions and recommendations, not exhortations and lamentations. This glimpse of the future is an important contribution to understanding our potential in the next decade and beyond.

Jean Delaney
Director, International Education
University of Colorado

Executive Summary

This paper attempts the hazardous task of forecasting the scope and profile of educational exchanges between the U.S. and other countries in the year 2000 as one approach to assessing the contribution of those exchanges to the international education of Americans. The forecasts are based in part on predictions relating to political stability, economic growth, and likely developments in higher education in major world regions. Especially pertinent to U.S. exchanges in the coming decade are *glasnost* and *perestroika* in the Soviet Union, the urgent need for international cooperation (including exchanges) to address major global issues, the spreading scourge of AIDS, and certain developments in higher education in the U.S. and abroad.

The review of major world regions highlights the following:

- probable growth in exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe;
- little foreseeable growth in exchanges with the Middle East/North Africa or with Africa South of the Sahara because of political and economic problems;
- the centrality of solving the debt crisis to the future of Latin America and exchanges with it;
- likely growth in exchanges involving Asia, propelled by its burgeoning economic situation, especially in Japan.
- the importance in Western Europe of "Europe 1992" and ERASMUS which may bring or impede more U.S.-Europe exchanges, depending on various factors;
- several aspects of U.S. higher education developments that are likely to affect international exchanges.

Following this *tour d'horizon* the implications for future exchanges between the U.S. and the rest of the world are set forth in eleven points.

The second half of the paper focuses on the contribution of international educational exchanges to Americans' learning about other countries and culture and international issues. This is done in terms of foreign students in the United

States. American students going abroad, and faculty exchanges, and how international learning might be enhanced by each.

The paper concludes that special efforts are required if international educational exchange is to make a more significant contribution to Americans' international education; the mere existence of exchange does not assure this contribution. This situation should be more widely understood if such efforts are to receive the support they require. Some specific recommendations propose strategies and programs to strengthen the contribution of exchanges to international learning in the United States.

Introduction

International educational exchange is only one among the multiplying linkages that connect and increasingly transcend individual states and nations. Frederick Wakeman, president of the Social Science Research Council has described these linkages as ranging:

> from international banking, trade and market networks, economic and military interdependencies, labor and political migrations, international standards and regulations, intellectual and information exchanges, multilateral treaties, multinational corporations, and energy and technology flows, to religious missionary movements, advertising media, and the cosmopolitanization of a middle-class consumer culture.[1]

To what extent will one category of global linkages, international educational exchange, contribute to the international education of Americans in the 2000, and how might this contribution be maximized?

Before addressing the issues involved, some definitions are appropriate: For purposes of this paper "international educational exchange" refers to students and scholars from one country pursuing study, research, and/or teaching in another country, whether for a relatively short period (e.g., a semester or less) or for several years. While study abroad at the pre-college level can give students cross-cultural skills and a lifelong concern for international issues, this paper focuses on exchanges at the post-secondary level.

What is international education and why do Americans need it? Dean Michele Totela Myers of Bryn Mawr college, in her remarks at a college convocation, deplored Americans' lack of understanding of the world:

> We remain provincial, fragmented, divided, deaf to the crisis of those here and abroad whose color differs, whose experience and ways of seeing the world contrast with ours, whose values may force a reexamination of ours.[2]

More and more, international education is defined or looked to as giving Americans the knowledge and skills required for the U.S. to be competitive in international markets and with foreign countries so that American business is able to profit from, rather, than be disadvantaged by, our international interdependence. In commenting on priorities for the 21st century, Marina Whitman, vice president at General Motors, pointed to the "rapid global integration of

markets—markets for goods, markets for services, markets for technology, markets for ideas."[3] To perform effectively in these globalized markets more Americans should have a knowledge of other countries, cultures, and languages. Especially essential to successful relations with people from other countries are the cross-cultural skills that are learned through direct interaction with foreign cultures and people (i.e., through international educational exchange).

Sven Groennings, a distinguished scholar in the field of international education, made a cogent case for international education in 1988:

> ...in our global economy, everyone needs international education because everyone is affected. Examples: engineers because this country annually does $15 billion of contractual civil engineering around the world, technology transfer across cultures has become common, and engineers are being promoted to management positions in the technological economy which is global; lawyers,...; accountants,...; city mangers...; journalists, who cannot explain local news without international context. For consumers, investors and voters, for all Americans, the global economy has become directly pertinent.[4]

In 1987 and again in 1989, special reports by the National Governors' Association focused on the urgent need to strengthen international education in the U.S. in order to respond more effectively to the competitive forces of international commerce. The then governor of New Jersey, Thomas H. Kean, chair of the panel preparing the 1989 report, summarized its thrust in the statement that without additional training in international studies, Americans "will get—and there is no other word—outcompeted in the world market."[5]

This paper first attempts to identify future economic, political, and educational developments, internationally and by major world region, that are likely to deter or encourage international educational exchange between the U.S. and the rest of the world. The purpose is to try to project the scope and main characteristics of this exchange a decade hence. The second part of the paper explores the contribution of international educational exchange to international education and ways to enlarge it. The conclusion provides recommendations.

Forecasting economic and political trends and developments in higher education is hazardous, and is made all the more difficult by the accelerating pace of change. However, if the projections for the year 2000 set forth in this paper prove to be radically off base, at least they may stimulate more attention to the field of international exchange and how it might better contribute to Americans' international learning.

Developments Likely to Affect International Exchanges

The International Political Scene

Several forces and developments on the international scene seem likely to stimulate increased international exchanges of students and scholars in the coming decade, unless offset by certain other less favorable developments.

The waning of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union with the inauguration of *glasnost* and *perestroika* under Mikhail Gorbachev, combined with the lessening of several regional conflicts (Iran-Iraq, Angola-Namibia, etc.) may usher in a period of greater stability around the world. The reinvigoration of the peace-keeping role of the United Nations is part of this. At the same time dramatic changes in Central and Eastern Europe—the ousting of Stalinist and other leaders plus demands for democracy and market-oriented economics—may well bring about a major destabilization in Europe. The probable reunification of Germany and the demands for autonomy by some Soviet republics and Soviet and East European minorities may pose major threats to economic growth and political order in the entire region. Thus, while the demise of Cold War tensions should reduce the crushing defense burden for the U.S. and USSR and free up resources for such priorities as international educational exchange, such a "peace dividend" is not apt to involve large sums.

Even if the reduced Soviet threat initially diminishes the rationale for federal funding of international exchanges—specifically those related to the ideological competition with the USSR—presumably this would be temporary. In a multipolar, rather than bipolar, world in which its links with allies are no longer assured by a shared anti-Communist stance, the United States will need an expanded and more diversified national program of exchanges in order to cultivate and cooperate with many categories of countries. Moreover, instead of funding scholarship programs that focus on political strategy, federal support for international exchange could target such goals as institutional development, economic growth, and the solution of major world problems.

Already today, few of the major problems afflicting nations can be effectively addressed within a single nation state. Some of these problems include ac-

celerating desertification, acid rain, thinning of the ozone layer, hunger and poverty in developing nations, drug abuse, and terrorism. As these problems become yet more acute, and the gap between the rich and poor countries widens, efforts to address them become ever more urgent. As stated by Abdus Salam, Pakistani physicist and Nobel Prize winner:

> ...if the "great divide" between the rich and the poor nations is not closed, ... the North will no longer be able to "insulate itself" politically from the South...What will happen is what is happening already in the third world —turmoil, military governments, unrest, and "people on top of each other."...No parts of the world are going to be safe from the feeling of turmoil.[6]

To help solve these major world problems, the United States will continue to turn to the universities and to international educational exchange. Cooperating in research with scholars and specialists from other countries and offering advanced training to Third World nationals will still be important strategies in the year 2000, and should involve more collaborative approaches. In the projected expansion of efforts to solve major world problems, international educational exchange between the U.S. and other nations should not only expand but be an important vehicle for the international education of Americans.

One major world problem, AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome), which is becoming increasingly serious as more and more people are infected with it worldwide, may be a significant deterrent to international educational exchange by the year 2000. AIDS is already a major health crisis in some African countries and is spreading dramatically in Latin America, and the fear of contracting the HIV virus may deter American faculty and students from going to countries where it is widespread. Even now some foreign countries refuse to admit students from the U.S. without medical proof that they are free from AIDS. If no cure for or vaccination against AIDS have been found by the year 2000, it promises to become a serious deterrent to international exchanges with some regions and countries.

The International Educational Scene

Turning more specifically to the higher education scene internationally, four trends are likely to affect U.S. exchanges with the rest of the world by the year 2000: First, demographic projections point to a decline in the number of college-age individuals in the United States. Second, the demand for post-secondary educational exchanges exceeds the supply of places available in many countries. Third is the quantity/quality issue in which priorities are shifting toward ensuring the quality and societal relevance of that education. Fourth is

the trend for American scholars, especially in sciences and engineering, to take shorter sojourns abroad than some years ago.

Projections of the college age group in the U.S. point to a decline of 20 percent or greater in the 1990s, a decline that began several years ago. Even though college enrollments have so far declined very little as older and other non-traditional students have made up the shortfall in the college age group, a number of U.S. colleges and universities have taken up active recruitment of students from abroad as a means to keep total enrollments up. These recruiting efforts are likely to have a continuing effect of maintaining or increasing the pool of foreign students who can be a resource for the international education of fellow American students.

A trend that may fuel more international exchanges is the increased stress on the quality of higher education and a de-emphasis of egalitarianism and accessibility. This trend is most visible in Western Europe and North America. The motivation—to ensure national competitiveness at the cutting edge of scientific and technological advances—in practice means more competition for admission to the top-ranking higher education institutions. In this situation some disappointed students may choose to study abroad rather than attend the less selective institutions at home. Similarly, international exchanges in the coming decade will also be expanded by the number of students in countries whose higher education institutions lag in offering such new fields as information systems, organizational theory, computer science, biotechnology, etc., who go abroad to pursue studies in these fields.

A factor making for a decrease in the educational exchanges of the U.S. with other countries is the apparent reluctance of scholars, especially in the sciences, to go abroad for long-term rather than short-term (one month or less) visits. A trend identified by Dorothy Zinberg in her 1980 report, *America and Europe —Changing Patterns of Science-Related Travel,* the finding also applied to scholars in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities in official exchanges between the U.S. and the Federal Republic of Germany 1978–85. During this period, according to a study by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation,[7] short-term visits increased from a level of around one-half of all visits to two-thirds or three-quarters. Adding to this trend has been the shortening of periods abroad for Americans funded under the Fulbright Senior Scholar Program. The 1987 annual report of the Council for International Exchange of Scholars states, "In 1982, about 38 percent of the awards made to Americans were for periods of less than 6 months; in 1987, short-term awards accounted for 44 percent of the total."[8] While the reasons for shorter sojourns abroad by American scholars (the falling dollar, two-career families, etc.) are understandable, the impact is qualitative as well as quantitative in terms of Americans'

international education as briefer sojourns tend to involve less immersion in the host country's culture and hence less interaction with and learning about it.

With this brief survey of some factors likely to affect exchanges, the next section discusses relevant developments by major geographic region.

The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

As suggested earlier, recent developments in the Soviet Union offer the promise of altering world politics in the coming decade and opening the door to greatly increased levels of international educational exchange between that country and the United States. President Gorbachev's determination to transform the system that has paralyzed the Soviet economy, taking it beyond a point of no return if successful (and this will take considerable time), should result in a more market-oriented economy and far less bureaucratized society. While one cannot underestimate the enormous problems involved—a long tradition of authoritarianism, the divisive stresses of many nationalisms in the non-Russian republics and the opposition to glasnost and perestroika of bureaucrats, dogmatic Marxists, and a public afraid of change—Gorbachev's political skills and determination may make the reform efforts underway a success.

With these changes in the system, including a greater flow of information, the intensity and volume of educational exchanges are likely to expand. Already, for example, the USSR has urged a substantial increase in the number of scholars exchanged with the United States through IREX (the International Research and Exchanges Board) from 40 per year to 300. Perestroika itself will expand exchanges as more and more institutions in the Soviet Union initiate programs to bring more Americans to that country, especially students and teachers for summer and other short-term programs. The increase in American college students studying Russian, from 23,000 in 1980 to nearly 34,000 in 1986, is indicative of student interest in Soviet studies and, presumably for many, in studying in the USSR.

The rapid rate of expansion in student exchanges probably cannot be sustained during the 1990s because of various practical and other obstacles: limited student accommodation at the Soviet higher education institutions, costs (including travel) and the non-convertibility of the ruble (while it lasts), and probably, a continuing level of bureaucracy and control in the Soviet Union which may limit the number of Soviet students and scholars who are approved to pursue studies in the U.S. An insufficient pool of Americans wishing to pursue studies in the Soviet Union will not, it seems clear, be an obstacle unless many of these students opt to study in Eastern Europe instead.

By the year 2000 important changes may have taken place with regard to some of the obstacles mentioned earlier. *Perestroika* promises to produce

important restructuring in Soviet higher education. It is notable, for example, that in negotiations with IREX, the State Committee on Public Education in the USSR has proposed to send more scholars to the U.S. in the social sciences and humanities, fields of knowledge important to the reforms underway in the Soviet Union. As such fields as business, management, and marketing are developed in Soviet higher education institutions, to help meet the perestroika-generated demand for managers and entrepreneurs, U.S.-USSR exchanges going both directions will (and already do) include increasing numbers of scholars in these fields. Access to U.S. science and technology will, however, continue to be a strong motivation behind Soviet interest in educational exchanges.

Glasnost-driven reforms are apt to be accompanying a move towards decentralization in the now highly centralized Soviet education system to encourage more student originality, creativity, analytical skills and independent approaches, and to reduce the extremely specialized overloaded curricula now typical of the higher education system. Such changes are now being initiated as a result of a 1987 officially approved document which called for, *inter alia*, "a strengthening of individual approaches and the development of creative abilities of future specialists through independent study and active forms and methods of training." Such changes should facilitate undergraduate exchanges (American undergraduates are apt to find the traditional Soviet curriculum unduly lecture-oriented), and stimulate more Soviet interest in graduate level exchanges that can offer Soviet students the more independent study and research-oriented opportunities for advanced study found in the U.S.

U.S. educational exchanges with Eastern Europe will experience even greater growth in the 1990s than those with the USSR. The dramatic new openings in the region, probably even extending to include Albania, plus the pent-up demand of decades during which flows of students and scholars in both directions were hardly a trickle except for Poland and Yugoslavia (a special situation), will cause exchanges of students and scholars to soar. Of special interest to U.S. students and faculty will be fields such as film, culture, Byzantine studies, archaeology, politics, and of course, topics in economics related to the adaptation of socialist systems to market economics. A number of U.S. students and scholars having "roots" in central and eastern Europe will also be attracted to the region.

International exchanges are apt to enable far fewer students and scholars to come to the U.S. from the Eastern European countries than vice versa, even with the possible convertibility of their domestic currencies to dollars, decreased bureaucratic restrictions, and greater decentralization in higher education. Limiting factors will include a lack of funding and scholars' difficulty in taking leave from their teaching duties in the face of escalating enrollments at home. However, the dramatic changes in Eastern Europe will prompt a number of

U.S. colleges and universities to find ways to support advanced students and scholars from countries concerned, especially institutions with East European Studies Programs and/or located in regions with important ethnic communities of East European background. The federal government will also expand its support for students and scholars to come to the U.S. Even so, many more students and scholars from Eastern and Central Europe are apt to go to higher education institutions in West Europe than in the U.S. for reasons of cost, geographic propinquity, and historic ties.

The Middle East and North Africa

This region is not likely to achieve a much greater degree of economic growth or political stability unless there is a settlement of the Israel-Arab world conflict (i.e., agreement on the status of Palestine). The Arab world and, indeed, the entire Muslim world, deeply humiliated by the Palestinian situation, will continue to demand an acceptable resolution. Whether international negotiations required may lead to the establishment of a separate Palestinian state and concomitant diminished tension in the region by the year 2000 is still an open question.

Apart from the Palestinian question and such other problems as the legacy of the eight-year Iran-Iraq war, the policies of the government of Libya, etc., other factors that will continue to affect stability in the region are the continuing rise of Muslim fundamentalism and the greatly reduced price of oil since the early 1980s, after being the chief source of badly needed export earnings during the preceding decade for a number of the countries in the region. Even though the OPEC nations may successfully collaborate to assure a higher minimum price for oil, this is not likely to bring back the level of revenues which in the 1970s supported so many Middle Eastern students for study in the U.S.

Another major destabilizing factor in the region is the rate of population growth, especially in Egypt where it is expected to rise from 55 million today to over 70 million by the year 2000. The impact of this growth will extend throughout the region as excess population spills over into other countries, especially the Sudan, and it will impose severe problems in such areas as education, food, and employment, to mention only some.

An assessment of prospects for stability in the Middle East must take into account that *glasnost* in the Soviet Union may alter U.S. foreign policy priorities in the region. Less targeted on "the evil empire" and hence at supporting countries contiguous to the USSR such as Iran and Turkey, the U.S. may instead seek more collaboration with countries important to the more effective functioning of the American and international economies. If U.S. technical assistance is then focused not so much on resisting Soviet influence abroad but on reducing

the problems such as hunger and poverty in the less developed countries, this may contribute to more stability and growth in the Middle East.

Even with the optimistic assumption of relative stability in the Middle East in the year 2000, prospects for greatly increased international exchanges between that region and the United States are limited. The fact that the higher education facilities in most of those countries fall well short of meeting enrollment demand will not result in significantly increased numbers of Middle Eastern students pursuing studies in the U.S. Standing in the way will be lack of funding, probable difficulty in obtaining visas because of U.S. concern about possible brain drain, and the reluctance of some of the countries to see their youth Westernized through study in the U.S. The situation varies widely among countries; Egypt, for example, has severe overcrowding of universities because all high school graduates have the right to enroll, while in Algeria the expansion of higher education has been a deliberate counterweight to youth unemployment. In Jordan, one-third of the college-age group attends higher education, but Iraq had difficulty filling places in higher education because of the recent expansion of facilities and the conscription of so many of the age group for military service, and in Kuwait many of the men study abroad.

Similarly, while the numbers of American students and scholars going to the Middle East will doubtlessly increase by the year 2000 unless there is major disruption in the region, the increase will be modest. Deterrents include lingering associations of terrorism and instability with the region, problems of the availability of adequate research facilities, the relatively small pool of American students who study Arabic (3,417 in 1986, a decrease since 1983), and the anti-Middle East attitude found in the U.S. fed by the negative stereotyping of Arabs in the media.

If international exchange is to overcome these deterrents and contribute more to a greater American understanding of the Middle East, it is clear that special efforts will be needed between now and the year 2000.

Latin America

The level of international educational exchange between Latin America and the U.S. is less now than it was a decade ago. Unless firm measures are taken virtually throughout Latin America to solve the debt crisis, economic conditions will deteriorate further and political stability may be undermined, lowering still further the level of international educational exchange between that region and the U.S., by the year 2000.

International bank lending to the Latin American countries, up from $35 billion in 1973 to $350 billion in 1983 and financed to a large extent by the Mid-East oil producing countries, abruptly declined in the early 1980s. This hit

the debtor nations at a time when their shrinking export earnings were hard put to meet the high interest payments running at around $30 billion per year, highest for Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina, in that order. The difficult measures required to reduce foreign indebtedness threaten to erode popular support for elected governments, now found in 90 percent of the countries, and generate political unrest, or worse. A report issued by the Inter-American Dialogue, a group of experts from the United States, Canada, Latin America, and the Caribbean stated:

> The Latin America debt crisis may soon touch off a political crisis. As governments lose credibility and authority, the appeal of extremist solutions is rising, and it becomes harder to institute the economic measures needed for recovery and growth. Latin America may be condemned to a long period of economic hardship and political turbulence, which may force civilian authorities to yield to military rule in some places.[9]

The economic situation in many of these countries has already seriously deteriorated, causing hardship to higher education institutions as well as to the populations at large. High rates of inflation, the steady erosion of living standards, and shrinking gross national products characterize the economies of the region. Further threatening stability are the impact of the drug economy and traffic in several Andean nations, especially Colombia, the mounting terrorism and escalating war between the armed forces and Shining Path guerrillas in Peru, and, of course, the turbulence and conflict that have plagued much of Central America for some years.

As a consequence of the worsening financial problem, its universities are experiencing shrinking budgets, shortages of equipment, deteriorating physical facilities, the erosion of faculty salaries and a serious decline in quality. Compounding the effects of the economic situation has been the rapid growth of higher education enrollments in some countries, for example, in Argentina, where enrollment has tripled since President Alfonsín abolished entrance examinations in 1984. Moreover, the expansion of numbers in the national universities and their greater susceptibility to strikes and other closures has both depressed quality in these institutions and driven many students to enroll in the growing number of private universities, the quality of some of which is also questionable. With higher enrollments and deteriorating quality have come problems of graduate unemployment.

The foregoing scenario is far from promising for prospects for international exchanges between Latin America and the U.S. in the year 2000. With the declining quality of higher education, more and more students from there will seek to study abroad, including the U.S., but will have more difficulty funding it. The combination of declining quality and possibly increased social and political unrest is not likely to attract larger numbers of U.S. students and

scholars to the region, except perhaps to such more stable countries as Ecuador and Brazil. However, if the major restructuring required to deal with the region's massive foreign debts is well underway in the late 1990s and succeeds in stimulating economic growth, as part of this growth one may hope to see the beginnings of an expansionary phase for international exchanges with the U.S.

Africa South of the Sahara

The outstanding recent publication of Michigan State University on the role of the United States in international development in the 1990s, *New Challenges, New Opportunities*, cogently presents the disturbing prospects for Africa in the coming decade unless the needs identified in the report are urgently addressed:

> Unless deteriorating conditions are turned around, an increasing number of African countries will suffer economic stagnation, increasing poverty, environmental degradation, and decay of their already fragile social and political institutions. Should this occur, not only will a major continent become increasingly marginal to the international economy and society, but the lives of millions of Africans will be unbearably bleak.[10]

To give a few concrete examples of the situation, whereas the African continent could feed itself in 1960, now it must import two-fifths of its food. The rate of population growth is the highest anywhere in the world at any time in human history. Unless checked by the year 2025, according to a United Nations projection, the population of Africa will equal those of Europe and North and South America combined. Infant mortality and starvation are increasing. Contributing to this economic plight have been a range of political conflicts and other problems, including loss of revenue for the oil-producing nations.

Higher education in Africa and the outlook for increased educational exchanges between Africa and the U.S. at the end of the next decade face grim prospects unless major efforts to improve the African economies are undertaken and are effective. While it is impressive that higher education enrollments in sub-Saharan Africa rose from 20 to 437 million between 1960 and 1983, a World Bank Policy Study reports that the quality of higher education in many of the countries is in a crisis situation. As a consequence of the economic downturn, university budgets are depressed, and funding is scarce for such basic needs as supplies, laboratory equipment, books, and even water and electricity.[11] Given the grim situation in many of the African universities, one cannot expect many more U.S. students to seek to enroll in the black African universities (around 60 students in 1988). Also, the high demand from home country students impels the African universities to sharply limit the number of students they can accept from other countries. Expanding the number of U.S.

students in special programs outside the universities may be the most practical way to give an African study experience to more Americans.

Without increased funding, especially from external sources, it is unlikely that the African nations can send more students and scholars for study in the U.S. The number has, in fact, declined by around one-third since 1982-83. If, however, recent recommendations of the World Bank for readjusting, revitalizing, and expanding education in Africa south of the Sahara are implemented with respect to upgrading quality in higher education, this should encourage more international exchanges of students and scholars with other countries, including the United States. The report stated:

> Resuscitation of long-term efforts to upgrade the academic qualifications of staff is also essential. Formal postgraduate training in masters and doctoral programs, for the time being mostly outside of Africa, is an essential part of this effort. But the need extends much further, to postdoctoral fellowships, faculty exchanges, collaborative research, and other professional links with foreign universities through which African academics are exposed to new developments in research and curriculum in their fields.[12]

Whether the United States will expand international exchanges with the African nations along the lines deemed necessary by the World Bank in the coming decade can only be conjectured. However, given the extraordinarily difficult situation in Africa, perhaps the real question is: Can the U.S. afford not to expand exchanges?

Asia

Leaving aside China, if recent trends in international exchanges between Asia and the U.S. continue into the year 2000, with over half of all foreign students currently in the U.S. from Asia (52.2 percent), not only will Asia, especially the Pacific Rim, be a dominant focus and force in world affairs in the twenty-first century, but it will play an even larger role in international exchanges.

As with the dramatic changes in Eastern and Central Europe in late 1989, so also did the spring 1989 student-led democracy movement in China and its brutal suppression at Tiananmen Square stun the U.S.—and underscore the unreliability of projecting into the future. Whereas before Tiananmen Square, one could claim that the prospects for peace, political stability, economic growth, and international collaboration in Asia were more propitious than they had been for some time, events in China make such assumptions problematic. Even so, contributing to a more positive environment in the overall region is the diminution of regional tensions involving Cambodia, India-Pakistan, North and South Korea, and even China and the Soviet Union. While various internal conflicts and potential threats to peace and stability, such as the Sinhalese-Tamil conflict in Sri Lanka, can erupt and trigger wider regional violence, the more

constructive role played by the USSR in regional disputes not only means they are less apt to become superpower issues, but also helps in their resolution.

The economic growth of Asia shows no signs of abating, although not all countries are participating in this boom. Led by Japan's post-World War II miracle economy which, despite the soaring yen, had a growth rate of over 5 percent in 1988, the four newly industrialized countries (NICs) of the region—South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, with Thailand about to become the fifth—can also point to impressive growth. Increasingly, India is emerging as a modern industrial power, while the six-country ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations: Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, Thailand, and Brunei) constitute the seventh largest trading partner of the United States. China, a "sleeping giant," with its population of over one billion the seventh largest economy in the world, and its commitment to development through economic liberalization, seems likely to continue expanding its economy and its role both regionally and internationally. The Soviet Union, pushing to be more recognized as a Pacific Rim state, will probably try to affect Asian affairs more and expand its activities in the area. Sharing less in the economic growth of the continent will probably be some of the poorer or more isolated countries, such as Bangladesh, Vietnam, Nepal, etc.

The growth prosperity of some Asian countries or of sectors within them and the growth of the middle classes in some of these countries promises to put more pressure on their higher education systems and to enlarge the numbers of young people interested in and able to afford studies abroad. Turning to specific countries, one can project the following.

For China the short-term future will involve economic and political regression, instability in the national leadership, and considerable anxiety and frustration among students and intellectuals. U.S.-China educational exchange will take some time to regain the levels of of the late 1980s, if in fact they do. Brain drain and other concerns on both sides will continue the priority for short-term scholars rather than degree students coming to the U.S. The concerns of American students and their parents about security, isolation, and the deteriorating quality of life in China may also deter many U.S. students and, to a lesser extent, scholars from going to China.

In the longer term, the underlying forces for moderation in China are sufficiently strong to enable it to weather the leadership succession struggle and bring the country back onto the road to reform. When this occurs, the pressure for students and scholars to go abroad for study or research is again likely to increase. Even though higher education institutions in China have doubled since 1978 and student enrollments have increased 170 percent over 1978 to 2.57 million in 1988-89, the percentage of the college-age group able to enter higher education in China is less than two. This competition for graduate

admission and the unfavorable working conditions in China for graduate students and scholars will continue to make study abroad, including in the U.S., very attractive.

From the point of view of American students and scholars going to China, it seems likely that their numbers will again increase, but at a slower rate than in the 1980s when the novelty and excitement were higher, (American students studying in China totalled 6,600 between 1979 and 1986). While the Tiananmen Square events and an increase in American students interested in study in Taiwan may limit numbers going to China, the flow of American scholars to China will increase as scholarly endeavors in that country become more advanced and pursued in collaboration with U.S. scholars.

In Japan the government's commitment to international education, officially stated in 1984, and its more recent concern to strengthen and expand graduate education should increase student exchanges with the U.S., at least temporarily while the capacity for graduate enrollments in Japan catches up with the demand that the new priority to graduate education is likely to trigger. By the same token, an expansion of graduate student programs in Japan is likely to attract American students which now are very few, partly because of limited programs.

It is questionable whether Japan can increase its foreign-student enrollment to 100,000 by the year 2000, the originally articulated objective of internationalizing higher education in the country. The high cost of living in Japan and the cross-cultural challenge foreigners face in penetrating Japan's homogeneous culture will continue to limit the number of American students and scholars studying, teaching, or researching in Japan.

The number of Japanese undergraduates studying in the U.S. is likely to rise toward the year 2000 with the erosion of the tradition that the best careers are accessible only to graduates of Japan's most prestigious universities. This tradition is eroding because of the growing number of Japanese families that live abroad for long periods, (for example, with the overseas offices of Japanese business firms) whose children do not make it into the top universities because of their foreign schooling. This is putting pressure for change in the system. Coupled with this development is the growing demand of Japan's internationally involved business firms for Japanese staff with experience abroad and proficiency in English, thus making an American undergraduate education more attractive to the Japanese either in the United States, or at the increasing number of branch campuses in Japan of U.S. colleges and universities. This demand by Japanese business will also cause continuing growth in the number of Japanese students in Intensive English programs in the U.S., currently the largest national group in these programs and comprising close to one-third of all Japanese students in the U.S.

The newly industrialized countries (NICs) are also likely to expand international exchanges with the U.S. in the coming decade. Their dynamic economies will continue to fuel student demand for higher education beyond the capacity of their colleges and universities, long a phenomenon in Hong Kong and Taiwan and apparently a growing problem in Singapore and more so in South Korea. With a real GNP annual increase of 9 percent since 1960 to a total of $120 billion in 1987, South Korea, no longer the "Hermit Kingdom" of tradition, has produced an increasingly large and well educated middle class, determined that its children have a college education and able to pay for it abroad, if not at home. Reflecting their growing importance internationally, the NICs are also apt to attract more American students and scholars in the 1990s, partly in recognition of expanding U.S. interests in the Pacific Rim nations.

Elsewhere in Asia the picture is mixed in terms of international exchanges in the year 2000. With a substantial and growing middle and upper middle class in India, less so in Pakistan, the burgeoning demand for higher education in these countries will more and more exceed supply. Perhaps more important, problems of quality and graduate unemployment, especially in India, will continue to make foreign degrees attractive. The limited graduate student capacity in India will also continue as an important motivation for study abroad.

With respect to some of the other countries—Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines—the trends of recent years showing an increasing number of students coming to the U.S. from these countries should persist. For the first two countries student demand will continue unmet for some years (in Indonesia the public universities could not accommodate 80 percent of applicants in 1987), while for the Philippines a U.S. degree for historical and related reasons will still be attractive. But one cannot underrate the possibility of a quite different scenario. For example, international exchanges between Indonesia and the U.S. may sharply diminish in the 1990s when Suharto moves off the scene, and intensified anti-Americanism in the Philippines may adversely affect scholarly exchanges there when the U.S. military bases agreement comes up for renegotiation. If Muslim fundamentalism in Malaysia becomes much stronger, it may alter that country's educational priorities, significantly reducing the flow of students to the U.S. which grew so dramatically in the 1980s. The same is true with other Muslim countries.

Western Europe

The major event facing Western Europe in the coming decade in commonly referred to as "Europe 1992." In that year the twelve-member countries of the European Community will remove barriers to the internal movement of goods, capital, people, and services. The new Single Internal Market, comprising 320

million people and with a GNP of $4.6 trillion and one-fifth of the world's trade, is perceived by some as a threat to the leverage of the U.S. in international affairs and to its share of world trade. There is also concern that U.S. educational exchanges with the EC countries of Western Europe will be affected. A basic issue is whether the major expansion of intra-EC educational exchanges will reduce interest in and resources for U.S.-Europe exchanges, or instead will catalyze more U.S. exchanges with Europe by making them more popular and feasible in Europe.

Apart from Europe 1992, various other developments in Western Europe seem likely to increase exchanges between it and the U.S. in the 1990s and beyond. The impressive economic growth rate of the last few years is expected to continue and even go up. This—combined with the trend for more university graduates to go into private sector employment instead of the traditional public sector—is expected to expand demand for higher education, especially in such fields as business, management, and computer science.

Demand for higher education will continue to exceed supply in the Federal Republic of Germany and the 1.5 million current enrollment in a university system built for 850,000 will not drop to that intended capacity until the mid-1990s. Until then the steady stream of German students coming to the U.S.(5,000–6,000 per year mainly for graduate study) is likely to continue. France has widely supported the goal of expanding education so that by the year 2000, 80 percent of the age group obtain the baccalaureate. If 90 percent of these enroll in higher education, this would more than double the higher education enrollment. Even if this goal is only partially implemented, the resulting pressure on staff, facilities, etc. might prompt more students to pursue studies abroad, including in the U.S. In the U.K. likely reforms in secondary education will probably expand the number of students who complete that level as well as the proportion who go on to higher education, if there are places for them.

Offsetting, to some extent, these increased demands will be a sharp drop in the college/university age group in most of the European countries resulting from low birth rates in the 1970s. An exception is Spain, where the baby boom enrollments will keep rising. Unless an increased proportion of the college age group enrolls in higher education—and for most of the countries it already is between 25 and 30 percent (but only around 14 percent for the U.K.), enrollments of 18–24 year olds will fall in the 1990s. It is expected that the European higher education institutions will counter this trend by taking in more part-time and older students, but because such students are less likely to study abroad, this demographic trend may somewhat reduce the number of European students interested in study in the U.S.

In connection with the foregoing statement, it is important to stress the difficulty of generalization. For example, the flow of students to the U.S. from West Germany, around 4,000 per year, is likely to continue because of special support provided to some of them through the German Academic Exchange Service and a German financial aid scheme, plus linkages between German and U.S. universities, and other factors.

A development indirectly related to Europe 1992, which should have a major impact on international exchange, is "ERASMUS," the European Regional Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students. Authorized in 1987 by the Council of Education Ministers of the European Community, its aim is to increase intra-EC student exchanges from 1 percent of all students in higher education to 10 percent by 1992. The rationale is to educate more students who can function professionally in another EC country and to broaden the base for economic and social cooperation within the Community. ERASMUS sponsors study in another EC country for at least three months (soon to be for at least six months and to include Austria, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries), as an integral part of students' degree programs, paying such extra costs as travel, language preparation, and living costs, plus faculty expenses incurred in developing inter-institutional collaborative arrangements. For its first three years, 1987–90, the budget of around $85 million supported some 25,000 students annually (32,000 in 1989-90). As the increased student mobility supported by ERASMUS makes study abroad more accessible and acceptable to EC students and higher education institutions, it seems likely to stimulate more study abroad generally, including to the U.S., especially on an exchange basis.

An ERASMUS-related pilot scheme, the European Community Course Credits Transfer System (ECTS), should also give encouragement to Europe-U.S. exchanges. It aims at the creation of a European academic credit system to facilitate the recognition in one EC country of studies completed in another. The development of this system, if it can be articulated with the U.S. credit system, might give a significant impetus to exchanges of students between American and European higher education institutions.

In the long term, probably after the year 2000, the greatest impact of the European Community on U.S.-Europe educational exchanges may come from the EC agreement on the mutual recognition of professional and higher education qualifications. It will make all diplomas and other awards involving a minimum of three years study recognized as valid for qualifying for relevant employment throughout the Community. If this leads to significantly more EC professionals pursuing part or all of their careers in another EC country, it might contribute to "decoupling" or loosening the long-standing close connection between higher education qualifications and employment in many European

countries. This situation which causes graduates, for example in West Germany, to have very specific employment expectations in terms of level, salary, etc. based on their university qualification, has deterred students from seeking a degree abroad because foreign degrees have not been recognized in this way, especially for public sector jobs, including in the schools. Should increased intra-EC professional mobility bring some decoupling of higher education and employment expectation and opportunities, more students might seek degrees abroad, because foreign degrees have not been recognized in this way, especially for public sector jobs, including in the schools. Should increased intra-EC professional mobility bring some decoupling of higher education and employment expectation and opportunities, more students might seek degrees abroad, including in the U.S.

A final consideration likely to affect educational exchanges between Western Europe and the U.S. may be a disenchantment with the U.S. by Western European students and scholars. The United States is increasingly seen as lagging rather than leading, whether in technology, or public policy, or in cultural creativity. While this development doubtless relates to the escalating interest in Eastern Europe because of events there and to an excitement among Europeans that the "Age of Europe" is on the near horizon (Europe 1992, etc.), it also is related to the relative status of the U.S. internationally and especially in the eyes of what is rapidly becoming a leading entity in global politics and economics, Western Europe.

The United States

In exploring developments and situations likely to affect exchanges between the U.S. and other countries, it is important to examine aspects of U.S. involvements with exchanges. This section focuses on foreign students in the U.S., American students studying abroad, and American faculty and scholar exchanges.

With regard to foreign students, recent enrollment trends point to a continuing but low rate of increase. Several factors are at work. The high percentage of students earning doctoral degrees in the sciences and engineering who are from abroad (close to 40 and 60 percent respectively for 1988) is of increasing concern within American universities and to public agencies sponsoring research and hiring the doctoral graduates in these fields. The concern about this situation seems likely to bring some restrictions on future growth.

The rising cost of study in the U.S. for foreign students, especially at some of the private institutions (which may cost $18,000 per year) will act as a restraint on enrollments. This close relationship between rising costs and student enrollment is illustrated in Canada where costs have gone up to as much as

$25,000 (Canadian) a year because of higher tuition fees for foreign students, resulting in a four year decline in foreign student enrollments.

The competition for foreign students from an increasing number of other countries will affect the numbers electing to study in the U.S. in the 1990s and beyond. This situation internationally has changed radically since 1967 when Great Britain introduced a modest differential in tuition fees for overseas students over home student fees (£250 compared to £70) in order to diminish the British taxpayer burden of subsidizing large numbers of foreign students. Since then the tuition for foreign students (but not from the EC and certain Asian nations), after being raised to several thousand pounds and more depending on the field, now ranges from around £4300 to £5900 in arts and sciences fields. While foreign student enrollments declined steeply in the early 1980s after the initial large tuition increase, they have since been steadily rising. Much of the growth can be attributed to aggressive recruitment abroad by the U.K. higher education institutions, including in the U.S., to the point that the chairman of the University Grants Committee warned universities against becoming dependent on foreign student fees to balance their books.

As austerity budgets in various countries drive higher education institutions to seek new sources of funds, the competition for foreign students is intensifying. Australia now charges foreign students tuition ranging from A$8000 a year for a humanities degree to A$20,000 for engineering. The Australian trade commission, Austrade, is anxious to increase foreign student enrollments in that country because of their importance in export earnings, over A$230 million in 1989. New Zealand has also adopted higher fees for foreign students together with extra efforts to recruit them.

Turning to study abroad by American students, just as the active recruiting of foreign students by various countries, especially the U.S. and U.K., has raised numbers of foreign students in these countries, so has this recruiting in the U.S. increased study abroad by American students, a trend which seems sure to continue in the 1990s. The recent study by Richard D. Lambert, *International Studies and the Undergraduate*,[13] documented an increase in this activity, although it confirmed that only a very small fraction of all undergraduates study abroad. Along the same lines, a 1987 survey by the American Council on Education showed that two-thirds of four-year college and universities operated study abroad programs, and that opportunities for study abroad had increased in the preceding five years.[14]

In *Abroad and Beyond* Craufurd Goodwin and Michael Nacht emphasize the lack of reliable statistical data on study abroad. In carrying out their 1986 survey involving several months of institutional visits and interviews at a cross section of institutions, they found "widespread agreement that the rate of growth has accelerated sharply," and even refer to this growth as "startling."

> We typically ended our discussion at an institution by asking what study abroad would be like on the campus we were visiting a decade hence. Most projected confidently substantial growth. In some institutions where study abroad has not been well developed to date we detected an almost alarmist sense of having been left behind and needing to get on the train even though it has already left the station.[15]

Whether the high growth rate found by Goodwin and Nacht persists or even increases in the coming decade will depend on how the field develops. Much more faculty support will be required to make study abroad an integral part of the degree program of more and more students, especially in professional fields, a necessary development if American engineers, lawyers, and staff in business and trade are to function effectively in their increasingly internationalized professions. Whether study abroad by American students expands significantly in the 1990s will also depend on whether the special efforts being made to recruit students from minority groups, still extremely limited, are expanded and result in more of these students having the opportunity to study abroad, as strongly urged in the recent report, *The Faculty Factor.*[16]

It is estimated that less than one-fifth of American faculty spends time abroad in teaching, research, consulting, or conference attendance. In order to increase this activity more, incentives and support are needed. Even so, an experience abroad is not likely to be an option for the estimated one-third of all academics who are part-time. Burton R. Clark, Allan M. Cartter, Professor of Higher Education and Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles, in referring to these part-time people as "the migrant laborers of academe,...disposable dons, freeway scholars,"[17] well implies how their lack of status and funds tends to keep them out of international exchanges.

For full-time professors, the drawbacks include the sliding dollar, working spouses, limited or no sabbatical leave, and the faculty reward system. The latter, of course, varies among institutions. For example, an institution like Kalamazoo College which ranks international education high offers special grants to faculty to have a period abroad which will strengthen their international contacts and experience, while the research-oriented universities primarily reward scholarly output and grantsmanship in faculty promotion and tenure.

The lack of reliable current data on numbers of American faculty members participating in international exchanges makes it difficult to forecast whether the 1990's will bring increased participation. The 1978 survey carried out by Everett C. Ladd, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset which showed that 57 percent of faculty had not journeyed outside the U.S. even once for educational, scientific, or other scholarly reasons, is probably still reasonably valid. Decreases in the number resulting from such factors as the decline of the dollar and mounting terrorism have probably been offset by the increase resulting

from more international networking in fields relevant to the transfer of technology. The Ladd-Lipset survey showed that faculty going abroad the most were in medicine, engineering, humanities, and the social sciences in that order, and were much more from major research universities (71 percent) than from community colleges (29 percent). More went to the U.K. than to any other country (22 percent).[18]

If faculty interest in spending time is an index of the future of U.S. involvement, the difficulty experienced by the Council for International Exchange of Scholars in recruiting American faculty to apply for Fulbright Scholar awards in much of the world outside of Western Europe does not augur well for expanded numbers of U.S. scholars going abroad by the year 2000. A project recently embarked on under the auspices of the International Association of Universities to map the exchange relationships between universities in various major world regions will, one hopes, produce some of the data on the field needed to project future trends and directions.

Implications of Pertinent Developments Worldwide for Exchanges

This section tries to pull together and suggest some of the likely implications of the foregoing *tour d'horizon* for educational exchanges between the U.S. and the rest of the world in the 1990s and beyond. Even though, as stressed at the outset, predicting the future is a hazardous enterprise, the preceding exploration of prospects for political stability, economic growth, and educational development permit the following statements about the future of international educational exchanges and the factors affecting them.

1. The new international political climate resulting from the radically changed posture and policies of the Soviet Union, by helping solve rather than escalate regional conflicts will more and more be supportive of educational exchanges.
2. U.S. policies towards educational exchanges will become less geared to a cold war mentality and more toward the solution of the major transnational problems which increasingly affect the well-being of the U.S. and threaten economic growth and political stability worldwide.
3. The increasing diversification among the non-Western and/or developing countries makes it impossible to generalize about educational exchanges between them as a group and the U.S. Some have achieved impressive growth rates which will continue to contribute to the stimulation and support of higher education and international exchanges. Some of the poorer countries, now poorer than a decade ago, can less afford educational exchanges. For funding agencies they will be a lower priority for the 1990s than meeting the pressing needs for basic education.
4. The problems of population growth and environmental degradation in many geographic regions, and of poverty, hunger, etc., in much of Africa, are becoming so urgent that U.S. financial assistance will have little choice but to give more priority to these problems than to

international educational exchanges except insofar as exchanges target these problems.

5. The growth of a middle class in many of the non-Western countries, especially in Asia, by stimulating the demand for higher education beyond the capacity of national systems, will expand demand for education abroad, more at the graduate than at the undergraduate level.
6. As intraregional cooperation becomes more important to the political, educational and scientific relations of countries in different geographic regions and the quality of higher education institutions in them is enhanced and recognized, more students are apt to attend university in another country in their region, possibly decreasing the number coming to the U.S. in the coming decade (or inter-region, e.g., some West-German-funded projects).
7. This rising quality of many higher education institutions in the non-Western and developing countries in terms of their scholarly productivity, research involvement, and similar endeavors, will stimulate more educational exchange with the U.S. as American scholars increasingly collaborate in research and other projects with academics at these institutions, many of whom will have been trained in the U.S.
8. Developments in the 1990s in the European Community, which will bring greater social and economic integration among the twelve member countries, will also increasingly integrate their higher education systems through dramatically expanded educational exchanges. The expanded intra-EC educational exchanges and possible development of a transfer credit system should, by making foreign study more feasible and visible, stimulate more student exchange between the U.S. and Western Europe.
9. The gathering momentum of study abroad by American students and a greater priority for preparing graduate and undergraduate students, in professional fields such as engineering and business for international careers will expand U.S. study abroad generally, as well as fields and foreign countries that are currently underrepresented.
10. Student exchanges between the U.S. and both the developing and developed countries will increasingly involve industrial placements and cooperative education experiences with foreign firms; this trend is part of the increasing collaboration in science and industry between the U.S. and other countries and the increased international involvement of American business.

11. The remarkable advances in communications technology, e.g., fax, teleconferencing, etc., will facilitate and accelerate communications between U.S. faculty and researchers and their colleagues in the coming decade. However, they will not significantly reduce international faculty exchanges involving research abroad and conference participation because of the importance of direct personal contact in a collaborative relationship between scholars of different cultures.

International Exchanges and International Learning

The next part of this paper looks at the extent to which international educational exchanges contribute to Americans' learning about other countries and cultures in terms of foreign students, American students going abroad for study, and faculty exchanges, and ways this learning might be enhanced.

Foreign Students

Despite the common rhetoric that the presence of foreign students at a U.S. college or university helps internationalize the campus and is a resource for the international education of the community, this tends not to be the case unless deliberate activities are undertaken to achieve these aims.

Most foreign students are graduate students, primarily concerned with working hard and excelling in their academic programs. They are often short on time and money, mostly socializing with other graduate students, especially other foreign students, who face the same situation, and frequently having only limited proficiency in English. Generally they are neither skilled nor disposed to invest much time in educating Americans about their home countries.

More than half of all foreign students in the U.S. are from Asia,[19] over 80 percent from the non-Western and developing countries.[20] The reserve or diffidence of many, especially from Asian cultures, in reaching out to communicate with and educate Americans about their countries limits their contribution to international education.

American students tend to be so internationally uninformed, even uninterested, that they hardly know how to strike up a conversation with a foreign student, especially one from a non-Western culture, let alone develop the kind of relationship which involves important international learning for the American.

The distribution of foreign students among various courses and disciplines restricts their contribution to the international education of American students and professors because most are in the sciences and engineering, fields which do not lend themselves to transmitting intercultural or international education.

The more foreign students in an individual college or university, the less they contribute to international education, as pointed out by Alice Chandler in her 1985 report:

> ...in earlier days when the number of such students was relatively low... the individual student and his (usually his) cultural background made an impact on the campus. Paradoxically, that personal impact seems to diminish as numbers escalate. One reason is that foreign students tend to cluster in national groups, thus reducing potential interactions with the receiving environment. Another reason may be that foreign students in large numbers tend to be perceived as an undifferentiated mass—sometimes a slightly threatening mass—rather than as persons.[21]

With over 40 percent of all foreign students in U.S higher education in 1988-89 at institutions (84) with 1,000 foreign students or more,[22] this clustering of large numbers in relatively few colleges and universities reduces their overall potential for educating American students.

Another factor that holds down this contribution was noted by this writer in a recently published paper:

> Patterns of student interaction inhibit the contribution foreign students might make to internationalize the learning of Americans. It is the atypical, not the typical, American students who are more likely to get to know foreign students. Øjar Øyen described this situation in terms of "marginals" and "centrals." Marginals are students who, for example, join an international student club. The centrals "were the gregarious, well-integrated individuals who placed the greatest emphasis on the ties they had to members of their own group; they were more closely tied to their own culture." Because the centrals apparently steer away from foreign students, they do not become internationally educated by them.[23]

The foreign students coming to the U.S. for periods of only one year, or perhaps less, as part of reciprocal exchanges or other programs seem to contribute more to Americans' learning about their home countries and cultures than do the foreign students coming for a full degree program. The shorter stay of the former, their frequently having been competitively selected by their home institutions, their concern to learn about the U.S., and their concentration to a large extent in the social sciences, humanities, and business/management all add up to much more international learning for the Americans.

The fact that so many foreign student advisers and offices at U.S. colleges and universities tend to be overburdened is another deterrent to international education. The Goodwin and Nacht publication, *Absence of Decision*,[24] while somewhat controversial in some of its claims, makes a valid point with regard to this. Only with difficulty can many foreign student offices muster the staffing and other resources needed to mount programs that involve foreign students in the international education of the campus and beyond.

Although not lending itself to documentation, there is evidence to suggest that the increasing international interdependence of the U.S. with the rest of the world is causing more Americans to become more nationalistic and anti-foreign. This situation makes such Americans unreceptive to international education and unsupportive of the foreign student presence in American colleges and universities.

If the presence of foreign students does not stimulate spontaneous activity which enhances the international education of Americans, how can this be made to happen? Numerous models exist. Some of these have been developed or refined with the sponsorship of the Cooperative Grants (COOP) Program of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). Funded by the U.S. Information Agency, the COOP program provides small grants, normally a maximum of $6,000 each, to institutions and organizations to enrich and strengthen the U.S. experience of nonsponsored foreign students and the study abroad experience of American students.

Possible approaches to enhancing the contribution of foreign students to Americans' international education based on the experience of the NAFSA COOP Program, tend to fall into the following categories: (1) host family programs, (2) activities facilitating foreign students' interaction with American students, (3) international speakers bureaus, (4) programs of community education, (5) foreign students contributing to education in elementary and secondary schools, and (6) programs which encourage communication and interaction between foreign students and special groups such as farmers, business leaders, and the like. These are discussed in the following pages.

Host Family Programs

These range from American families inviting a foreign student (or scholar) home for Thanksgiving or Christmas dinner, to having an ongoing relationship with a foreign student, e.g., getting together monthly or weekly, to the family's putting up the foreign student as member of the family for a weekend or even an entire academic year. A limitation of this activity is that the Americans who are already quite knowledgeable and have traveled abroad are more likely to host foreign students, and they probably gain less international learning from the experience than American families with little international experience.

For host family programs to contribute more to the international education of U.S. citizens, they should reach out and target people who are not usually involved, as with University of Iowa project which deliberately recruited host families from small rural communities.

Interaction: Foreign and U.S. Students

Interaction between American and foreign students may be more the exception than the rule on college campuses. The more different the culture of the foreign student's home country, the more difficult and less likely is the interaction. A model for encouraging more interaction between American and foreign students was the COOP-funded "Buddy System" project at the University of Colorado at Boulder. It paired foreign students with American counterparts in the residence halls in order to encourage participation by the foreign students in residence hall and university-level cultural, social, and educational activities. As the project director reported, the American student "buddy" performed the very important function of acting as a "liaison for the foreign student to access various facets of American culture."

International Speakers Bureaus

Identifying foreign students and scholars who will give talks to community and other groups on aspects of their countries and arranging for them to do so has been recognized for many years as an important vehicle for international education. Experience has shown that for an international speakers bureau to be a success, there are several essential conditions. Considerable effort may be required to identify and then provide training to the foreign students to speak to groups, for example, to take into account that American audiences tend to expect public speakers to be diverting as well as informative, whereas this is not the case in some other cultures. Foreign students and scholars may be reluctant to take the time from their academic work required for a speaking engagement. Effort must also be applied to finding community and other groups that will welcome a foreign student/scholar to speak about his/her home country and, if possible, pay for or handle the person's transportation to the event. The most serious hurdle may be staffing the international speakers bureau.

Community Education Programs

Another time-honored model, the community education program, typically involves cultural, social, and/or recreational events which highlight foreign countries and cultures. They may take the form of an art festival, a special film showing, a musical event, or an elaborately organized international fair. At an international fair booths may be set up by different national groups, displaying handicrafts, artifacts, national dress, etc., selling dishes typical of the country's cuisine, and showing films or slides about the country. While such an event can be interesting and enjoyable for the community by emphasizing the exotic and even "foreign" aspects of other countries and cultures, the international educa-

tion may be limited and reinforce national stereotyping rather than bring greater international understanding.

An unusual variant of the community education program model was the COOP-funded project, Interacting with International in Crisis. Carried out by North Texas University, it involved a half-day workshop for front-line personnel from city and university offices to inform them about foreign cultures and the likely behavior patterns of students from these cultures in a crisis situation. The personnel attending were from the police and fire departments, the city utility department, and local hospitals, along with university staff in counseling, health, student services, etc. The basic purpose was to make the participants more sensitive to foreign nationals they might have contact with in high stress situations such as sudden illness, car accidents, etc.

International Classrooms

An early example of this model, the International Classroom project in the Philadelphia area, established basic parameters for this approach for educating school children about other countries by having foreign students visit class and serve as an educational resource. Experience has shown that, as with the international speakers bureau, the selection and training of foreign student participants is important to their successful performance in the classroom. Close cooperation with teachers at the host school is also crucial.

An impressive recent or current approach to the international classroom is the International Cultural Service Program (ICSP) of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, probably the most creative approach thus far to involving foreign students in international education in the schools.

ICSP allows foreign students to pay in-state rather than out-of-state tuition (classifying them as "residents by exception") if they devote 80 hours to cultural service per academic year (about three hours per week). Cultural service for most of the participants has meant assisting teachers in Oregon schools with programs about their home country, but it can also involve consulting with business or government agencies about their home country, language tutoring, or speaking to community groups. Students chosen for ICSP find they acquire important skills, gain insights on their own countries, and are more competitive in seeking employment. Benefits of the program have been summarized as follows:

> The International Cultural Service Program benefits everyone involved. It provides financial aid and invaluable experiences to participating foreign students. The financial aid helps the university attract a more broadly diverse international student community. The program gives structure to the process of learning from foreign students and gives Oregonians at many age levels opportunities for international contact. Considering that one in six jobs in

> Oregon is tied to international trade, there is increased recognition that a key to the future is developing more internationally minded people.[25]

Foreign Student Interaction with Business and Other Groups

International education programs to bring foreign students together with particular professional groups and interests, such as business leaders, engineers, journalists, farmers, etc., while relatively few, are likely to attract increasing interest and support in the 1990s as growing interdependence makes more and more professions international. An impressive model of this approach to international education is a COOP-funded project initiated by Metrocenter YMCA in Seattle that aims at linking business and service club people in host/mentor relationships with foreign students whose field of study corresponds to the work of the business people. Although small in scale, it provides students the opportunity to "job shadow," to test the real life application of their studies, and to interact socially with American professionals who have corresponding interests.

Experience with the various approaches discussed in the preceding subsection on involving foreign students in the international education of Americans suggests the following guidelines for the future:

- International education programs in which foreign students are a resource should have major input by the students themselves in their planning and implementation.
- Training is needed to ensure that the foreign student contribution is optimized, for the sake of the student as well as the program.
- Continuity in contacts, activities, leadership, and institutional commitment are important ingredients in building international education programs involving foreign students. These requirements underscore the need for on going administrative backup, staffing, and funding.
- In the last analysis the success of many international education programs involving foreign students, especially those which reach out into the wider community, depends on community interest and response and will continue to do so in the future. Most of all it depends on the organizations and individual volunteers committed to international education and willing to devote the time and expertise to carry out programs to this end. International education in the U.S. is deeply indebted to the Community Section of NAFSA (COMSEC), many of whose members are volunteers, for its leadership in local communities and nationally in exploring and implementing strategies to involve foreign students in the international education of Americans, along with pursuing its main mandate of mobiliz-

ing the community resources and people to strengthen and enrich the U.S. experience of foreign students.

Study Abroad by American Students

For study abroad to contribute to the international education of more Americans by the year 2000, the numbers participating should be substantially increased, for example, to 10 percent of all undergraduates, paralleling the goal of ERASMUS in the European Community. With more women majoring in business and management and students' growing perceptions that experience abroad can be an asset in the job market, study abroad by business students will continue to go up in the 1990s. This is also true to a lesser degree for engineering majors.

The proportion going to the non-Western and/or developing countries, now barely 10 percent, will rise for Latin America and East and Southeast Asia, but little if at all for the Middle East and Africa because of perceptions relating to the economic importance, political stability, and/or health and safety conditions in theses regions. In this connection it is striking that a representative cross section of American leaders, asked in 1986 where they would urge a son or daughter to go for postgraduate study abroad, mostly favored Europe (70 percent) followed by Asia (15 percent) with South America, Africa, and the Middle East each getting only three percent of votes.[26]

Study abroad will also expand as more college and universities respond to the increasing interest of entering freshmen in having undergraduate study abroad experience. Institutions are finding that having programs to encourage study abroad is an important student recruitment tool.

Study abroad will also expand in the coming decade as its contribution to students' international learning is more widely recognized. The 1980 report of the Council on Learning's survey of college freshmen's and seniors' knowledge of world cultures and international issues, carried out by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), found some positive correlation between students' having spent time abroad and their scores on the global knowledge and attitudes test.[27] A 1985-86 survey conducted at Ohio State University, using a global knowledge test based on the instrument used in the ETS 1980 survey, found that traveling abroad was the students' second most powerful predictor of their international knowledge (first was their attention to international news).[28]

A 1988 report of public views of the position of the U.S. in the world and "how the public sees itself fitting into the process of making and carrying out U.S. foreign policy" found what is aptly conveyed by the report's title, *Reluctant Internationalists: U.S. Citizens and Foreign Policy*, namely that the American

public tends to be reluctantly internationalist. However, persons with direct international experience such as study abroad were an exception:

> Those citizens who are more actively involved in foreign policy issues often have personal experiences that inspired this, such as time spent overseas or family business connections. As a result, many participants looked to increased people-to-people programs, like the Peace Corps and student and cultural exchanges, as important means of raising the level of citizen involvement with the foreign policy process.[29]

Findings on the U.S. participation in a major five-country multi-year study of the outcomes of study abroad, the so-called Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP), to be published in mid-1990,[30] document the effects, *inter alia*, on the students' foreign language proficiency and their knowledge of and concern about other countries and cultures and international issues. Participating in the U.S. were the University of California, the University of Colorado at Boulder, Kalamazoo College, and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, the coordinating institution for the U.S. side. In the U.S. "comparison group" students (students comparable to the study-abroad students but who did not choose to study abroad) were surveyed along with the study abroad students through pre- and post-study questionnaires.

The study-abroad students' interest in other countries and in international affairs was significantly greater after their foreign sojourn, and while the comparison group also showed higher interest in international affairs after their junior year, the degree of change was nowhere near as much as for the study abroad students. Most pertinent to international education, the study-abroad group's knowledge about their host country, which was poor to moderate before their sojourn, had increased dramatically by the end of their period abroad. Moreover, the more these students were integrated into their host institutions abroad and were able to interact with host country nationals, the more they learned about the host country. In short, it seems clear from this study that at least certain kinds of study abroad experiences, (those evaluated in the SAEP) produce substantial international learning.

Several other findings from this project have implications for study abroad in the coming decade. The first is that students who did not choose to study abroad were deterred because they thought it would be more expensive than the same period at the home campus, or that it would prolong their degree studies, or that it was not needed for or appropriate to their major. The second finding is that the study-abroad students in many cases had a sense of alienation upon returning, in part because the home institution did not try to build on the students' experiences abroad or find ways for it to give an international dimension, or tilt to students' total degree programs.

If study abroad in the year 2000 is to involve more students, these deterrents must be addressed. Study abroad should be made more affordable for more students, and they must be disabused of the common misperception that it usually is much more expensive than the same period at home. More faculty encouragement and commitment to study abroad will also be needed. Ways should be found to "articulate" study abroad more into students' total degree programs so that it is part of, not apart from, them. If study abroad is to maximize students' international learning, it should *not* be included in a guide to "alternative educational programs" being compiled by an organization whose name includes the phrase "Time Out."

SAEP data on the effects of study abroad on people's lives five to twenty years later, analyzed by Professor Emeritus John Useem of Michigan State University, revealed and affirmed the major outcomes this experience has in terms of lifelong international interests, lifestyles, and values. Most of the study abroad "alumni" are committed to making cross-cultural experience an important part of their lives, and handle their professional and other activities in ways to ensure a cross-cultural dimension. While rooted and active in their local communities, these people are cosmopolitan in their concerns and intellectual interests. They tend to follow foreign policy issues and apply analytical thinking to them. Having had the experience of coping in a foreign country and in a foreign language, these study abroad "alumni" tend to make special efforts to reach out to "the stranger in our midst." They also are overwhelmingly determined that their children will also be able to live in and come to know another country and its culture and people.

Perhaps the role of study abroad by American students in the year 2000 can be suggested by the 1987 commencement address of Derek Bok, president of Harvard University, in which he purported to read from a fictional history of Harvard soon after the year 2000, not so much, as he said, as a prescription or prediction, but "as a way of expanding our minds to consider the issues and opportunities before us." In this fictional and futuristic account of Harvard, Bok stated that:

> By the early 1990s, the faculty... agreed that no one should graduate from the College without at least six months of study or work abroad. In addition to their departmental concentration, each student henceforth had to choose a geographic concentration consisting of a foreign language, a core course or two on a foreign nation, and a period of study and work in that same country.[31]

While Bok evidently does not expect this or other futuristic international goals to be realized at Harvard by the year 2000, he makes clear that more, not less, study abroad will be part of its future, implying this as well for American higher education in general.

International Exchanges of Faculty

It is doubtful that the year 2000 will see a significant increase in the contribution of international faculty exchanges to Americans' knowledge of and concern for other countries and international issues. As pointed out earlier, the U.S. faculty who travel abroad professionally the most are in medicine and engineering, fields in which international education is not thought to have much of a role—as well as in the humanities. Despite much that has been said and written about adding an international dimension or perspective or content to courses in disciplines normally not associated with international education, this approach is still relatively rare among American colleges and universities.

The decrease in the period abroad for American professors awarded Fulbright grants for research or lecturing probably has had and will continue to have a negative impact on their becoming well acquainted with and integrated into their host countries. A 1973 study of "The Senior Fulbright Program and its U.S. Domestic Impact,"[32] prepared for the U.S. Department of State, showed that Fulbright professors were most likely to share their insights and understanding gained abroad with personal and professional acquaintances in the U.S. if they had participated fully and been culturally integrated into the life of the foreign country. It further found that this was more likely if their sojourn abroad was at least nine months rather than a shorter period. Even if, however, Fulbright scholars' period abroad is not lengthened and the number of American faculty going abroad does not go up very much by the 2000, some research on the impact of the experience indicates that it is very important in motivating faculty to contribute to international education. The late James S. Coleman studied the experience of the Rockefeller Foundation 1963–83 in investing over $140 million in higher education development programs abroad. With respect to American faculty who served abroad in this program, Coleman found the following:

> In assessing the legacy of their experiences upon their subsequent professional careers back at their home institutions, the number who considered themselves specialists on the country in which they served increased by 20%; . . well over half revised their courses, incorporating data on the host country or region; and a large majority (60–70%) judged that their experience significantly affected their theoretical interests, analytical frameworks, and research and publications. Thus the serendipitous consequence of a program aimed explicitly at the building of institutions in the LDCs was a significant increase in the internationality and cross-cultural awareness in the perspectives and orientations of the participating U.S. academics, which they brought back to their classrooms and infused into their subsequent professional activities.[33]

A survey of more than 3,000 former Fulbright recipients (two thirds of whom had faculty awards), conducted in connection with the 1978-79 President's

Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, also pointed to positive impacts in terms of international education.

> Some 80% of grantees formed permanent friendships abroad, while 70% have, since their grant, visited friends abroad, changed their "world view," or assisted foreign nationals in their area. Former grantees' sustained commitment to international involvement is further reflected in the fact that 54% are members of local groups involved in foreign affairs education, over 40% assist Fulbrighters in their area, nearly 20% have served as foreign student adviser. Former Fulbrighters are evidently concerned to keep in their own lives and share with others the kind of cross-cultural experience which is so central to the Fulbright experience.[34]

How much visiting faculty and scholars from other countries enable Americans to learn about their countries and cultures is difficult to know in any concrete way. Certainly, few come to the U.S. with this as a major purpose. To illustrate, a 1987 survey of the exchange agreements between all the universities in Thailand and institutions abroad revealed that what most of the Thai universities wanted from international exchanges was faculty development opportunities, especially doctoral training abroad.[35]

The more established and older universities' interests were directed more towards research opportunities for their staff. Whether Thai faculty coming to the U.S. under exchange agreements help educate Americans about Thailand and the kinds of issues it faces domestically and internationally probably depends most on whether college and university faculty and staff and local community groups and individuals take the initiative to contact the visitors and involve them in international education kinds of activities and programs.

A preliminary report of the study carried out in spring 1987 by Sherry Mueller, Director of the International Visitors Programs Division of the Washington headquarters of the Institute of International Education, on the domestic impact of the U.S. Information Agency's International Visitor Program, highlighted its important role in the international education of volunteer hosts. Mueller found that important motivation for the volunteer to host the foreign visitors was that "The Program contributed significantly to the education of their children" and "enables volunteers to travel by proxy."[36] Presumably similar international learning takes place when visiting foreign faculty and researchers at U.S. colleges and universities are hosted by colleagues in their institutions or by people in the community.

The lack of information and reliable data relating to American faculty going abroad and the functioning of international exchange may be partly remedied through the more systematic evaluations now requested of American colleges and universities by the U.S. Information Agency. Funded under its University Affiliation Program, the agency is trying to assess the real impacts of the program, which was initiated in 1982 to foster faculty exchanges in the U.S.

and abroad. It might also be noted that its continued competitiveness is evidence of the institutions' interest, and also that of the faculty identified for exchanges through these affiliations, in international educational exchange. By 1989 the affiliations or "linkages" exceeded 150.

In encouraging more American faculty to spend time abroad for professional purposes in the coming decade as a vehicle of international education, relatively brief sojourns should be facilitated and supported even if they involve less cultural broadening and acquaintance with the host country and culture than do longer periods. Periods of half a year or more are often out of the question for persons from two career families, persons at institutions with only a limited or no Sabbatical leave policy, for faculty whose positions are part-time, for those with ongoing commitments at the home location, and, depending on the host country, for faculty whose scholarly productivity depends upon the availability of first-rate library or laboratory facilities.

Key to attracting more U.S. academics abroad is gaining recognition for experience abroad in academic reward systems. Related to this, the reduced funds for senior Fulbright Scholar grants, the shortened time period abroad, and the increased proportion going for teaching rather than research compared to earlier years, have somewhat diminished the Fulbright image and impact. Another aspect of the program's image hampering the recruitment of U.S. scholars is the perception that in recent years the program has become less committed to the advancement of scholarship internationally. It is regarded as tarnished by having been used too much for the political, even ideological, aims of the Reagan administration, to the detriment of what Richard N. Gardner, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy, has referred to as "assuring an effectively functioning 'intellectual connection' between one's own and foreign countries."[37]

Conclusion

Will the pendulum swing away from international educational exchange in the coming decade, or will the year 2000 see expanded international exchanges and learning? Preceding sections of this paper have explored trends and circumstances likely to affect educational exchanges between the U.S. and the rest of the world, and have discussed prospects for their future and how their contribution to international education might be maximized. Some of the issues and possible developments likely to make the pendulum swing more in one direction or the other by the year 2000 are the following.

1. Will it be possible to sustain or even expand the international flow of students and scholars between the U.S. and the rest of the world in the face of a widening gap between rich and poor nations, a possible growth in anti-Americanism in some key countries around the world, and the relative decline of the U.S. as a hegemonic power vis-à-vis other major nations and regional groupings such as Japan, the European Community, India, and further down the road, China?

2. Will the growing focus of countries on intraregional exchanges, for example, within the European Community and ASEAN nations, reduce U.S. educational exchanges with countries in these regions? Alternatively, as seems likely with the EC, will the increased educational exchange within major geographic regions open doors to expanded exchanges worldwide?

3. How can collaborative relationships between U.S. and developing world scholars be implemented when incentives for Americans to spend time in the LDCs so often appear much less than vice versa?

4. Has study abroad by American students by now achieved a momentum of its own so that it will continue to increase?

5. Will Americans' awareness of international interdependence produce more nationalistic and anti-foreign sentiment, thereby serving as a disincentive to international learning, or will the American people recognize international education as an increasingly important priority because of the accelerating global interdependence?

6. Will the greater attention and political and societal role which the growing domestic minorities within the U.S.—Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians—will

demand and gain, deter or strengthen international and multicultural education in our increasingly diverse nation?

7. Will higher education institutions, community groups, state and federal governments, and private sector funding bodies recognize the importance of international educational exchange as a resource for the international education of Americans, and will they encourage and provide the support which is essential for exchanges to contribute to this education?

The extent to which the year 2000 finds a much more internationally educated citizenry in the United States will depend in large measure on the answers brought by future developments to the above issues. It is hoped that this paper suggests some ways in which institutions, organizations, and individuals might help shape these developments in the interest of an expanded international education and greater role for exchanges in that education. It is hoped that the following recommendations may reach and galvanize the commitment of persons who though less informed in the field of international education, might bring more visibility and clout to the problems and their solutions.

Recommendations

- To facilitate the contribution of foreign students to international education, U.S. colleges and universities should aim at enrolling a diversified foreign student population. They should encourage their U.S. students to become more informed internationally and to seek out and interact with foreign students as an important way to pursue this goal.
- If foreign students are to play a greater role in educating Americans about their home countries and cultures, this effort will require many more well conceived and organized programs along the lines of some of the USIA-supported NAFSA Cooperative Grants Program projects, the Oregon State International Cultural Service program, and other similar models.
- To expand the role of study abroad in international education, more American students should be encouraged to study abroad, especially in immersion situations that require or facilitate gaining a knowledge of the host country language, and, to the extent possible, as part of their studies towards requirements of the major.
- Study abroad returnees' studies back at the home campus should capitalize on their overseas experience in order to integrate it as an important part of the students' international education and of the institutions' international education commitment and programming.
- With the increasing cultural diversity within the United States, colleges and universities and funding agencies should give priority to enabling minority students (the underrepresented by ethnic, gender, and disciplinary criteria) to participate in study abroad, and in so doing to explore and reduce current deterrents, financial and otherwise.
- International faculty/researcher exchanges should be making a much greater contribution to the international education of Americans. Numbers should be expanded, the period abroad should, if at all possible, be targeted at a full academic year, U.S. institutions should involve their visiting foreign faculty/scholars actively in international education programs, and institutional funding of faculty exchanges should make their contribution to international education an important priority.

- For this priority to be realized, colleges and universities should make international activities and involvements of various kinds an important consideration in the reward system for faculty, including promotion and tenure.
- The higher education leadership within the United States should press the importance of international education and exchanges as an essential responsibility of U.S. colleges and universities if they are to educate citizens and train professionals for an increasingly interdependent world. This effort should encompass not only the curricular and extracurricular life of the institutions, but also their educational outreach and community and wider advocacy.

Notes

1. Wakeman, Frederick E. Jr., "Annual Report of the President, 1987-88," in Social Science Research Council, *Annual Report 1987-88*, p. 14.

2. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 28, 1987, p. B3

3. Kidder, Rushworth M., *An Agenda for the 21st Century*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1987, p. 81.

4. Groennings, Sven, "Public Policy and National Imperatives," A Position Paper for the Invitational Seminar on Planning Imperatives for the 1990s, held at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, November 21–22, 1988, p. 9.

5. *Jobs, Growth, and Competitiveness*, reports of the National Governors' Association, 1987 and 1989, and *America in Transition: The International Frontier*, respectively.

6. *Op. Cit.*, Kidder, p. 114.

7. Hoffmann, Rolf, *Trends in Mobility of Scientists and Engineers between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America*, Bonn: Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, 1988, p. 7.

8. Council for International Exchange of Scholars, *Fulbright Scholar Program, Annual Report 1987*, Washington, D.C., p. 6.

9. *The Americas in 1989: Consensus for Action*, A Report of the Inter-American Dialogue, Queenstown, Maryland: The Aspen Institute, 1989, p. 1.

10. Smuckler, Ralph H. and Berg, Robert J. with David F. Gordon, *New Challenges, New Opportunities, U.S. Cooperation for International Growth and Development in the 1990's*, East Lansing, Michigan: Center for Advanced Study of International Development, Michigan State University, 1988, p. 14.

11. The World Bank, *Education in Sub-Saharan Africa, Policies for Adjustment, Revitalization, and Expansion*, A World Bank Study, Washington, D.C.: the World Bank Policy Study, Washington, D.C.: the World Bank, 1988, pp. 74–75.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

13. Lambert, Richard D. *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

14. Andersen, Charles J., *International Studies and the Undergraduates, 1987, Operations and Opinions*, Higher Education Panel Report Number 76, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1988.

15. Goodwin, Craufurd D., and Michael Nacht, *Abroad & Beyond, Patterns in American Overseas Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 1–2.

16. *Education for Global Competence: The Reports of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange*, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1988.

17. Clark, Burton R., "The Absorbing Errand," Remarks presented at the AAHE National Conference on Higher Education, March 10, 1988, Washington, D.C., pp. 9, 23.

18. Ladd, Everett Carl, Jr., and Lipset, Seymour Martin, "The Ladd-Lipset Survey, Faculty Members Who Travel Abroad," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 24, 1978, p. 8.

19. Zikopoulos, Marianthi, Editor, *Open Doors: 1988/89, Report on International Educational Exchange*, New York: Institute of International Education, 1989, p.16.

20. *Ibid.*, p.18 (most statistics on foreign student enrollments in U.S. colleges and universities cited in this paper are drawn from this and earlier issues of *Open Doors*).

21. Chandler, Alice, *Foreign Students and Government Policy: Britain, France, and Germany*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1985, pp. xii, 29.

22. *Op. Cit., Open Doors*, p. 61.

23. Burn, Barbara, B., "International Exchange and Curricular Change," *National Forum*, Fall 1988, p. 32 and refers to Øyen, Ørjar," 'Marginals' versus 'Centrals,' " in Allaway, William H., and Shorrock, Hallan C., editors, *Dimensions of International Higher Education*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1983, p. 86.

24. Goodwin, Craufurd D. and Nacht, Michael, *Absence of Decision, Foreign Students in American Colleges and Universities*, New York: Institute of International Education, 1983.

25. Briggs, Peter, "Model Aid Plan: Oregon," *The Advising Quarterly*, Winter 1989, Number 7, p. 14.

26. Reilly, John E., Editor *American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy 1987*, Chicago: The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, 1987, p. 22.

27. Barrows, Thomas S., Klein, Stephen F., and John L. D. Clark, *What College Students Know and Believe About Their World*, New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1980.

28. Woyach, Robert B., "Understanding the Global Arena: A Report on the Ohio State University Global Awareness Survey, " Mershon Center, Ohio State University, 1987, p. 14.

29. Rovner, Mark J., *Reluctant Internationalists: U.S. Citizens and Foreign Policy*, Washington, D.C.: Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies, 1988, pp. 4, 5

30. Carlson, Jerry S., Burn, Barbara B., Useem, John, and Yachomowicz, David, *Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates*, Pergamon Press, 1990.

31. Bok, Derek,"Commencement Address," June 11, 1987, p. 6 (manuscript).

32. Burn, Barbara B., "Background on the Fulbright Grantee Survey Conducted by the Fulbright Alumni Association," President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *Background Papers and Studies*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979, pp. 222–223.

33. Coleman, James S. "Scholarly Exchange for University Development: A Recent Rockfeller Foundation Experience," paper prepared for February 23-24, 1984, Study Group on Research and Evaluation: Fulbright Scholar Program, Committee on International Exchange of Scholars. Manuscript.

34. Sweet, Charles F. and colleagues, "The Senior Fulbright Program and Its Domestic Impact," A Study Prepared for Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, 1973.

35. "International Academic Affiliations Survey," prepared with the support of the U.S. Information Service, Thailand, August 1987.

36. Norton, Sherry, "Ambassadors on Main Street, U.S.A.," National Council for International Visitors *Newsletter*, Fall 1987. XXXI, No. 2, p. 4.

37. Gardner, Richard N., "Selling America in the Marketplace of Ideas," *The New York Times Magazine*, March 20, 1983.